DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 146 975 JC 770 560

AUTHOR Cohen, Arthur M.
TITLE Saving the Humanities.
PUB DATE Nov 77
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Michigan Community College Arts and Humanities Association Conference (Schoolcraft College, Michigan, November 18-19, 1977)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Colleges; Curriculum Development; *Enrollment Trends; Humanistic Education; *Humanities; *Junior Colleges; Program Coordination; *Program Development; Teacher Participation; *Teacher Role

ABSTRACT

When will community college humanists recognize that their classrooms are diminished, their courses ignored, and their teaching fields assaulted by advocates of other curriculums, not because the humanities are less worthy, but because the advocates of career and medical education, to name but two, have stepped out of the classroom to take vigorous action? Why should those who advocate the humanities not adopt the slogan, "People need defense against dogma?" Why should they be reluctant to impose the value of an appreciation for the highest forms of man's expression of self through his art, literature, and music? The humanities are in a precarious state in our community colleges, not because they are archaic or unworthy or irrelevant but because the people who should speak for them have not raised their voices. (Author)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED146975

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Arthur M. Cohen

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SAVING THE HUMANITIES

by

Arthur M. Cohen

Speech to the
Michigan Community College Arts and Humanities Association Conference
Schoolcraft, Mich.
November 18-19, 1977

JC 770 560

Speech to the Michigan Community College Arts and Humanities Association Conference, Schoolcraft College, Mich. 11/18-19, 1977

Saving the Humanities

Arthur M. Cohen

There are many ways of speaking about the humanities in American life. We can discuss the quality of life, interest in the arts, or the values and culture around us. We could be quite subjective about our feelings of how the humanities are appreciated by our neighbors, revealed through our media, considered by policy makers.

Whatever approach we take depends on our definition of "humanities," a word that has been extended to cover all forms of human understanding. (It even is used to describe the broadest range of personal interaction as revealed in the words "humanistic," "humane," and "humanitarian," terms that suggest the person who is considerate of others, the psychologically "nice" individual.) We define the humanities much more narrowly, using a two-part definition in keeping with the direction taken by the National Endowment for the Humanities. The first part sees the humanities as man's expression of self through his art. Study of humanities thus takes the form of learning to understand, compare, criticize, and appreciate music, literature, art architecture, and religion. The second part sees the humanities in broader cultural perspective. Here one learns to value society, studying languages, history, anthropology, political science, and philosophy, learning about belief systems and thought patterns other than his own. In both aspects of the definition, as people study the humanities, they learn to translate their experience, to think metaphorically. They learn defenses against arrogance and dogma.

Speaking of the humanities in the community colleges of America is not difficult because, in common with all types of schools, community colleges

reduce concepts to curriculum, courses, and presentations. The state of the humanities in two-year colleges can be assessed by counting courses, enrollments, and the number of people who show up for humanities-related exhibits, colloquiums and recitals. A friend of mine insists that to him the course is the enemy of the humanities. He says that there is no central focus for the humanities in the curriculum now, that a student who is forced to meet a distribution requirement by taking one course in philosophy, one in literature, and one in hisotry does not necessarily acquire anything that enhances his understanding of art or culture. My friend wants the colleges to address the subject of the humanities directly rather than hoping for a secondary benefit that might accrue to students who enroll in courses in music, art, and other disciplines. He may be right but for better or worse, within the schools we segment life into courses, programs, and full-time equivalent enrollments. That is our language, the way we communicate with each other in terms that have a common referent.

And so the National Endowment for the Humanities defined the term when they came to us in 1974 asking for an assessment of the humanities in the two-year colleges in America. They said the humanities were courses and activities in any of the 19 disciplines: Cultural Anthropology, Art History and Appreciation, Foreign Languages, History, Literature, Political Science, Philosophy, and a dozen others. They knew that there were 1200 two-year colleges enrolling at that time nearly 4 million students. They also knew their Research, Fellowship, Education, and Public Programming divisions were not receiving applications for grants from people in two-year colleges in as nearly as high a percentage as they should. They had heard conflicting reports about the mission of the community colleges: were they post-secondary occupational institutes? Community education centers? Lower-division transfer institutions where students could

study the humanities just as they could in their freshman or sophomore year at a university? What were the trends in humanities, they wanted to know. Would the humanities survive in the two-year colleges? How could two-year college people be stimulated to do more in the humanities for their students and the people of the local communities?

We decided on a multi-phased study. First we did substantive reviews of the literature to determine what was already known about humanities in two-year colleges, reporting these findings in three monographs. Then we did a study of the faculty teaching the humanities, reported in a book entitled, The Two-Year College Instructor Today. More recently we completed a study of curriculum and we now have data on course patterns and enrollments for 1975 and 1977. And we are well along with a review of instructional practices and with a study of causes for the increase or decrease in humanities efforts.

I will report some of these findings to you todaybut first I should say that I am aware that I am a professor of education at a university. I speak in the jargon of education: courses, enrollments, goals and objectives. It is a specialized language, one that you may not speak or care to hear spoken. But before you dismiss my arguments entirely, consider that I am not only a researcher in curriculum and instruction, I am an advocate for the humanities. And my colleagues and I are careful with both our research and advocacy. As an example of the care with which we conduct research, we sampled 15% of the two-year colleges in America in the faculty study, balancing the sample for college age, emphasis, region, control, organization, and size. We sampled one-half the faculty teaching humanities in those colleges including both full-timers and part-timers. And we received responses from 84% of the more than 2000 instructors whom we surveyed. We took similar pains with the other phases of the study. Thus we have authentic data sets.

As an example of the care with which we advocate assistance for the humanities, we are making recommendations to all types of agencies: federal, state, and local governing boards; administrators; faculty groups; professional and disciplinary associations. Because these recommendations are not in the nature of, "It seems to me..." or "In my opinion..." but are based on the information we have obtained, we feel they are more likely to be taken seriously by the groups to whom we are presenting them. We do our work with care and we expect to be attended to.

I don't suppose that it will come as a surprise to you that the humanities are not being over-emphasized in the two-year colleges in America. The colleges seem more to be doing career, compensatory, and community education--today's three C's--just as the lower schools did the three R's in an earlier era. The colleges' emphasis on the three C's bypasses the humanities, leaving them to their traditional position in the baccalaureate/general education program. There they rise or fall with the ebb and flow of those college-parallel curriculums. In fact it is difficult to get people in the community colleges to perceive the humanities as an area of concern because the courses, programs, and patterns of thinking that are linked to the humanities are even more firmly linked to traditional academic programming.

What has happened to the humanities recently? Let's look at course enrollments in the 1200 colleges with their 4 million students. In Spring 1977 we noted the following enrollments:

History	335,000
Political Science/Government/Law	255,000
Foreign Languages	162,000
Literature	132,000
Integrated Humanities/Liberal Arts	90,000

Philosophy	89,000
Art History & Appreciation	60,000
Music History & Appreciation	46,000
Cultural Anthropology	36,000
Religious Studies & Ethnic Studies	under 20,000 each

(We do not present total enrollments in the humanities because these are head-counts and one student may be taking two or more courses.)

We found that in the two years between Spring 1975 and Spring 1977 total enrollments in our sample of 178 colleges were up by 7.4% while humanities enrollments were down by 3%. Some of the changes are notable. Cultural Anthropology was down by 10%; Art History down 6%; History down 8%; Literature down 13%; Music Appreciation down 9%; Philosophy down 8%. Three disciplines went against this trend: Political Science, up 5% as the Administration of Justice programs grow and because "Government" is typically still required; Integrated Humanities, up 6% with courses such as Modern Culture and the Arts cannibalizing enrollments from the traditional History and Literature Surveys; and Foreign Languages up 9% with all of that increase coming in Spanish and English as a Second Language. (ESL went up 84% in two years, and has nearly overtaken French for second place among language studies.)

We had expected a relative decline--the humanities holding steady while enrollment growth took place in other programs; we did not anticipate an absolute drop in the humanities courses. In brief, the humanities are shrinking. Unless trends are reversed, they will become a miniscule portion of the community college curriculum surviving only in the required Political Science and History courses with a few Literature and Integrated Liberal Arts courses offered as "enrichment," and with Spanish as a tool course for people who need to deal with

members of a non-English speaking population. Quite a comedown for the liberating arts, at one time the core of the college experience!

Assuming that we must maintain the study of culture and the arts lest our colleges degenerate into occupational training, remedial education, and community entertainment centers, what can we do? Push forward on all fronts of course. But how? We are working on this project under the assumption that the curriculum is amenable to modification, that it is not a grab-bag of offerings driven solely by student interest, that changes can be made, that the trends can be reversed. We believe that the curriculum is the product of some form of planning, chaotic as that planning may be. Decisions about what shall be offered are being made. We want to know who is making them and on what grounds. How much does the faculty work on curriculum and to what effect? What is the influence of outside agencies--state boards, professional associations, federal agencies? Who cares about the humanities?

We have partial answers to many of these questions. We know that the faculty are not as committed to their academic disciplines as they might be. We know that the links between the humanities in two-year colleges and the humanities in universities and secondary schools are tenuous. We know that the professional associations are little concerned with the humanities. We know that with the exception of the Endowment, no federal or state agencies are involved with the humanities in two-year colleges. All these groups must be addressed.

We have made many recommendations. We have not been saying that agencies should throw money at the people in two-year colleges so that they will support the humanities; we would not have needed a study to make that recommendation. Further, such a recommendation would be short-sighted; if an outside agency were providing the money the interest in humanities might well dry up along with

the funds. And if the governing boards were asked to provide extra funds for the humanities they would undoubtedly reject such ideas out of hand. We have been making recommendations that stem from our findings.

We have found several problems. The way the humanities are perceived is part of their problem. Funding and support patterns differ because of these perceptions. As an example, in the state of Illinois the community colleges receive around $17 per credit hour for students enrolled in traditional baccalaureate programs (including humanities) and somewhat more than $40 per credit hour for students in career programs. The reasoning is both that the career programs are more important to the people in the state of Illinois and that they cost more to teach. Skirting the question of whether it is more valuable for the state to have a person trained at taxpayer expense to work as a physical therapy assistant than it is to have a person learn the patterns of thinking that enable him to link his life with the heritage of his civilization, why should a career program cost more than a humanities program?

Traditionally, the humanities have been taught by a teacher in a room equipped with chairs and a chalkboard. Many humanities instructors have felt that contact between themselves and the students is the key element in studying the humanities, that all that is necessary for a person to learn the humanities is to engage in a dialogue and to read and reflect in a solitary fashion. The career educators on the other hand have taken the position that they need laboratories, shops, equipment, and links with the business and industrial community in order to teach people a trade. They say their students must practice the craft, not merely talk about it.

What would happen if the faculty teaching courses in Music Appreciation believed that for the students to properly learn to appreciate music the

college should provide each student with a stereo set and a couple of hundred classical records? What would happen if the faculty teaching Art Appreciation believed that students could not learn unless they were provided with slide viewers, sets of slides showing all the principal art in the western world, and funds to travel to museums? What would happen if the faculty teaching Cultural Anthropology insisted that students must be paid to work at archaeological digs for them to properly learn the ways of thinking in earlier cultures? Why don't the Political Science instructors insist that students be paid as apprentices to politicans and bureaucrats in all types of government agencies so that they can learn how decisions are really made? How can one learn a language unless he is paid to travel to a nation where that language is taught? Sound strange? The nursing educators insist that they must have laboratories, equipment, on-the-job-training. It would not occur to them to try to teach nursing in a room equipped with nothing more than chairs and a chalkboard. And so they get nearly $90 per student per credit hour and the humanities classes get $17. They get the funds and the equipment they need; the humanities instructors get chalk dust on their pants.

The humanities instructors seem not to understand the importance of these different perceptions about how courses can and should be taught. When faced with shrinking enrollments, a smaller percentage of college funds, lessened support from their top administrators and spokespersons, the best they come up with is some demands that their courses be required. Over and over we see that requiring courses is not the answer to diminished enrollments any more than it is an answer to diminished status and support. When unpopular courses are required students typically just walk around them. The universities are glad to take transfers regardless of what patterns of courses they have taken in the community colleges.

And if humanities courses are required in occupational certificate programs, the students may merely drop out of the program and get jobs in the trade anyway. Further, one of the reasons why community service, non-credit, and adult education are so much in vogue now in two-year colleges is that they open an end run around the entrenched faculty who are seen as imposing unrealistic requirements that students take what many administrators perceive as archaic, untraditional, academic courses.

Either the humanities are important or they are not. If they are important they are worth supporting. And if they are to be supported then perceptions of their value and the way they should be taught must be changed. It is not enough for the faculty and administrators who are concerned with the humanities to deplore the fact that students seem not to want to study them. If the college serves only to respond to student wishes, then how can it lay claim to a high order of service to its constituencies than that which is provided by a commercial television station or other medium that does little more than pander to the public? Educational programs can be stimulated, modified, sold, made relevant, made interesting, supported and pursued if they have intrinsic merit and if the people who believe they have intrinsic merit understand the necessity for vigorous, imaginative approaches to their work.

Modifying perceptions is a large order. We are not so short-sighted as to feel we can turn the entire system around. But we think we can move it a little. You must help if you believe in the humanities. Many faculty members seem to care considerably less about that which they are teaching, that to which they have ostensibly dedicated their professional lives, than they do about extra-curricular pursuits. They have been so turned away by the diminution of their curriculums and by a twenty-year long barrage of commentary on the value of career,

compensatory, and community education that they have given up. Many teach in the mornings and spend the afternoon selling real estate or potting plants or playing golf. And the humanities suffer.

Let me recount a few of the recommendations we have made. One is to the faculty and administrators at any two-year college where the humanities have been falling off. We feel that advocates of the humanities should take a leaf from the book that has been written by the occupational educators over the past twenty years. Twenty years ago vocational education as it was then called was a second-class portion of the community college curriculum. The vocational classes were offered in barracks buildings away from the center of campus life. Their teachers may not have been invited to faculty meetings. Certainly they were perceived as less than equal to the faculty teaching the transfer classes.

At that time the occupational educators set out to gain support for their offerings. They went to businessmen and union officials in their own communities. They camped on the doorstep of state education agencies. They lobbied the legislatures. They organized Trades Advisory Councils comprised not of mirror images of themselves but of people with power in the community. They gained control of the state education agencies and they worked so well at the national level that the Commissioner of Education a few years ago turned nearly the entire United States Office of Education in the direction of supporting career education.

The interesting characteristic of this twenty-year long effort is that much of it was initiated by people within the schools. In addition to the occupational educators' operating through the American Vocational Association and through other national, state, and regional groups, the people concerned with occupational education used their Trades Advisory Councils. The Councils not only offered advice to the program on what types of training workers should have, they

also helped in student recruitment and placement. The Councils acted as public-relations forums and helped steer students from job-entry levels to the programs where they were trained to work in the higher reaches of the trade. They assisted in job placement by advising the program directors on job availability for their graduates. Not least they have provided support such that the program staff can call upon them if a representation before a curriculum council, a college board of trustees, or an outside funding agency need be made.

We are recommending that educators concerned with the humanities form lay advisory committees to the humanities programs. Every community has business people, governmental officials, and laymen of every occupation who have some interest in the humanities. These people can be formed into advisory committees, doing everything for the humanities program that the Trades Advisory Councils do for the occupational curriculums. They can assist in recruiting students, help find employment for students, advise on curriculum, and, perhaps most important, support the program when it comes under attack.

As an example of the latter, suppose that one of the trustees at your college stood up at a board meeting and announced that since enrollments in foreign languages have been declining for several years, and since the universities don't require transfer students to take foreign languages as a condition of admission, and since there are many other places in the community where anyone who is interested in learning a foreign language can matriculate, the college should drop its foreign language program. Who would counter the proposal? Who would be there to pound the table on behalf of the college's foreign language program? Who would say that the study of language is important as a way of helping people understand the thought patterns of other cultures? It is too late to try to form a committee of supportive community leaders when the proposal is

already on the board's agenda. The time to form that committee is now, before the proposals are made.

There are numerous business, professional, and governmental leaders in your community who believe that the humanities are an important part of a college's offerings, that without the humanities the college is not worthy of the name. Those people should be mustered into committees. Go to the vice president of the telephone company who is a closet sculptor, the deputy mayor who attends every concert in town, the department store owner who has an extensive library of his own, the service club leader who gives art books as gifts and premiums. An affiliation with the college would be welcomed by the people whose contact with the humanities is limited to avocational pursuits. Meet with them three or four times a year; bring them into your deliberations and into your classrooms. They can offer much of value to your students. They can find students for you. They can help your students find jobs. And they may one day save your entire program.

We are making a second recommendation to humanities instructors. We feel that if the humanities are worth teaching, they are worth learning. And that if they are worth learning, then the teacher must have some students to teach them to. The expansion in community college curriculum in recent years has come in the occupations: police and fire fighter training; the health professions; real estate and insurance programs; auto mechanics; a wide variety of skills-training areas. The humanities in traditional course form are not found initially in these types of programs because the programs offer certificates, not degrees, hence they are not under general education requirements. Also the impetus to require the humanities suffers when the occupational programs are under the direction of a professional society such as those in nursing and accounting; the associations fill the requirements with specific work. Further, the faculty teaching these

specialized programs often feel that only they can speak to the career students. Having been on the outside of the teaching profession for so long or, what is even more likely, having not come in to teaching through the traditional graduate school ranks, they feel there is nothing useful in the transfer courses. And if traditional courses are required, students may drop short of the certificate or the degree and go to work anyway. Eventually, if the career becomes one that demands a baccalaureate degree, the general education requirement may be accepted. But humanities advocates cannot afford to wait that long.

Rather than insist on humanities course requirements for students in career programs, a quicker and more useful route to acceptance is to build a unit of the humanities course to be put in the occupational program itself. Here the humanities instructor or chairperson or program committee considers the ethical, artistic, religious, or cultural aspects of the vocation, discusses them with the people teaching in that trades field, and prepares a short segment to be fit in with the occupational program. It is a much more realistic pattern than that which demands that students in a nursing program, say, be required to take nine or twelve units of humanities. Such a requirement usually engenders resistance from the nursing program faculty who say it is all they can do to get the elements of nursing infused in a two-year course.

We have seen a few examples of this form of curriculum integration. Some faculty in the health fields have welcomed a unit of a course that considers the grieving process in various cultures around the world. That unit is taught by an anthropologist. They have welcomed a portion of a course on the ethics of euthansia presented by a philosophy teacher. A course module on the Greek and Latin roots of medical terminology taught by an instructor of Classical Languages has been successfully introduced. And course segments in medical ethics are frequently seen.

Progress in the direction of course modules built by humanities instructors in association with the faculty in career programs is slow. We hear all sorts of excuses including the argument that career programs are offered at night whereas the humanities instructors' courses are presented in the moring; hence it is a burden to merge the two. There seems no way around that--if an instructor prefers teaching in the mornings and refuses to have anything to do with the night program, little can be done. But some institutional modifications can be made to encourage the faculty who do want to broaden their teaching efforts.

We are recommending that departmental budget making and faculty workload formulas be adjusted to accommodate instructors who want to teach portions of a course in programs outside their own field. We are recommending also that instructional development grants and faculty fellowships within the institttuions be offered to instructors who want to work on these types of course integrations. We are urging the humanities instructors to build these types of course segments wherever possible as a way of bringing their discipline to students who might not otherwise understand the way the humanities relate to their own work.

Our studies of the humanities curriculum and the faculty have led us to make other kinds of recommendations to administrators, governing boards, and state agencies. We found that many instructors would like to see more extra-curricular activities in the humanities. In fact 37% of them said that if they had free choice in the matter they would devote more time to presenting recitals or lectures outside of class. Every community college has extra-curricular and community service activities; most offer colloquia, seminars, lectures, exhibits, concerts, recitals, film series, and similar humanities-related activities. Yet rarely are the faculty involved in planning and presenting these programs. The community-service director typically operates his program as a private fiefdom.

The director of student activities arranges extra-curricular presentations. The adult and continuing education director sets up non-credit courses and programs. And the full-time faculty members present their credit courses through an academic department or division. All these presentations, courses, and events stem from the same body of concept about the humanities, yet each is organized as though it was the only presentation of its type.

Here again faculty pay scales and workload formulas present an obstacle. Because they are typically based on the number of hours an instructor spends in a classroom they act to discourage faculty members from arranging extra-curricular and community-service presentations. Further, the budgeting formulas that see funds running separately to community services, to academic programs, to adult education, and to student activities militate against merging the activities around core concepts. Each activity draws its funds from a different source. Those who work and receive their rewards in one channel rarely step over the bank to consider what is happening in the other stream.

We are recommending new funding formulas that run to total programmatic emphases. We feel that the curriculum and extra-curricular programs, the community service and continuing education offerings must move closer together. Faculty members should get release time for organizing exhibits, colloquia, and seminars. Within the college the humanities program should be seen as an overarching form from which the various types of humanities offerings stem. We think it is deplorable that humanities programs and non-credit courses are offered through the community-services division without the regular faculty members being involved in planning and presenting these courses. We think it is deplorable that credit courses are planned and offered through the academic program without involving the continuing education and community service program operators. Each can

reinforce the other. Each can enhance the college as an institution concerned with the humanities in the life of the people in the district.

Another recommendation has to do with faculty interaction. Twenty percent of the full-time faculty in American two-year colleges teach one or more courses in the humanities; 10% of the part-timers teach humanities courses. The full-timers are affiliated with academic divisions or departments; the part-timers are paid by the academic budget if they teach credit courses but most of them are associated with the continuing education programs. In either instance the connection between full-timers and part-timers is very tenuous. Few part-time faculty members appear at departmental meetings. Few full-timers know or care what the part-timers are teaching even when they are teaching credit courses in the evening that bear the same course number and title as those the full-timers teach during the day. And faculty development programs for the part-timers are typically poorly organized and operated, if they exist at all.

We are urging that the full-time instructors take a lead in organizing programs to assist the part-time faculty in their own field. The part-timers must be brought into course planning as well because much may be learned from them. They must attend departmental meetings and help design curriculum. They must participate in extra-curricular activities; they must be carefully courted and brought into the life of the institution. No part-timer should teach an evening course, credit or non-credit, without a full time faculty member from that teaching area associating with them in course planning, delivery, and evaluation. I can see no reason to operate two separate colleges, one during the day and the other in the evening, both offering the same courses, leaving to chance any commonality between those courses. I can see no reason for employing graduate students

and part-time professional people to teach anything related to humanities without a full-time instructor working with them. Call it inservice training, faculty development, faculty evaluation, or by any other name--if the full-timers presume to know anything about the humanities and about pedagogy they should teach the part-time instructors in their own institutions. Such programmatic shifts do not require new funding arrangements; they merely rest on the determination of the regular staff who would insure that anything presented with a humanities emphasis is done well.

One last recommendation has to do with student recruitment and program articulation. We found that the majority of the faculty members know what types of courses are offered in their field at the universities to which many of their student transfer but that few of them have any idea about what is going on in the local secondary schools from which they draw their students. Yet weak or non-existent humanities programs in the secondary schools have considerable impact on the predilection of students to enroll in the humanities courses at the community colleges. The high school teachers of literature and history can send many students to your courses if they want to. The high school counselors can recommend that students who want to study the humanities go to your college. A secondary school with strong introductory courses in the humanities areas will provide you with students for your second level or specialized courses.

We found that few of the community college instructors want anything to do with the secondary schools, seeing teachers there as poor sources of advice on teaching, seeing little reason to affiliate with them. A high percent of the community college faculty still identify with the university and consider the university professor a model to be emulated. For the sake of their courses

they may be looking in the wrong direction.

You will not attract many students from the universities; most of them, I need hardly add, come from the other direction. You should organize articulation committees with the humanities instructors in the secondary schools so that you can talk about their courses and the relationships between them and your own. These articulation committees should work with the secondary school counselors to ensure that they understand what types of humanities courses can be found at the college. It is not enough to leave articulation with the counselors to your dean of students; that person may know little about the humanities programs and what they have to offer. This is something the faculty should do. It takes little time and the potential effects are enormous.

These are but a few of the recommendations that we have made and are continuing to make. Our other recommendations are addressed to national disciplinary associations and state and federal agencies. Many of them are included in an article entitled "Humanizing the Curriculum" in the June 1977 issue of Change Magazine. Others may be found in the papers noted on the ERIC publications list. They are summarized in our recent book. Together they should form an agenda for action to be taken by all community college educators concerned that the humanities not be lost.

To effect these activities you don't need to try to convince your colleagues--that effort alone will wear you down. You can, however, modify the conditions of your own work, expand your role. You can build course modules for the occupational programs, take responsibility for the part-time faculty in your subject area, continually and vigorously promote concerts, recitals, exhibits, and other non-course related humanities programs at your college, employ more imaginative ways of making the idea of the humanities a topic of public discussion.

Those who adopt this broadened concept of humanities instruction may eventually be seen as coordinators of the humanities for their colleges. In fact, we are proposing such a position. In order to assist in conceptualizing the humanities as an area of learning (rather than as discrete courses) and to help merge the disparate threads of the humanities in extra-curricular, adult-education, and community-service programs with the baccalaureate courses, we feel there should be Coordinators of the Humanities. This is a faculty member who is released from all but one or two of his classes to work as a consultant-in-residence for the humanities. This is a humanities advocate who knows how to get the humanities built into every new program: credit, non-credit, occupational, extra-curricular, or community service.

The occupational educators have succeeded because they became vigorous. Instead of hiding behind their classroom doors and deploring their lot, they organized themselves into regional, state, and national committees. They formed lobby groups and task forces. They adopted a rallying cry, "people need to work." They ignored the critics who said that for most jobs people learn best in apprenticeships. They ignored the obvious fact that the state of the economy, not the school curriculum, dictates the job market. They set aside the question of whether they had the right to impose their values on students and tried incessantly to instill the teaching of the work ethic in the public schools.

A lesson may also be drawn from the medical educators who have adopted the slogan, "people need health." Our colleges are filled with allied health programs. We teach X-ray technologists and nurses and medical secretaries and dental technicians and hygienists and nutritionists and a host of other practitioners in the health fields. Critics of the medical establishment question the development of drugs and forms of medication that create more problems than they solve,

but that does not stop the health science advocates who demand an ever-higher proportion of funds to install their educational programs in the community colleges.

When will the humanists recognize that their classrooms are diminisned, their courses ignored, and their teaching fields assaulted by advocates of other curriculums, not because the humanities are less worthy, but because the advocates of career and medical education, to name but two, have stepped out of the classroom to take vigorous action? Why should those who advocate the humanities not adopt the slogan, "People need defense against dogma?" Why should they be reluctant to impose the value of an appreciation for the highest forms of man's expression of self through his art, literature, and music? The humanities are in a precarious state in our community colleges, not because they are archaic or unworthy or irrelevant but because the people who should speak for them have not raised their voices.

Over and over we hear that students don't study the humanities because they want job certification. That is only partially true. Although students have been told repeatedly that they dare not leave school without first obtaining "a saleable skill," they will study what the institution in which they are enrolled believes they should study. In the 1960s a vociferous minority of students challenged the colleges' authority, and when they said, "You have no right to tell me what I shall study," the educators crumbled, saying, "Take what you want." Now the pendulum is swinging rapidly toward required courses. A Harvard college committee has recently recommended a core curriculum as opposed to a pattern of general education distribution requirements. The Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Education has just published a book that recommends core general education requirements, including the humanities. The pendulum moves away from

the idea that people can attend any courses of their choosing and call themselves educated. Hop on it and pull the humanities along with you. I am not ready to surrender the community college to those who would use it primarily, if not exclusively, for the purpose of training people to work. Are you?

I cannot believe the humanities are irrelevant in American life or are so perceived by your students. In Westwood Village, a few square blocks near UCLA, are 17 movie screens. Who goes to the films? There are 4 record stores. Who listens to music? There are 13 book stores, and innumerable paperback book racks; someone is reading. What are the bridges between all those activities and the courses at your college? What are the common needs of the people who see the films and buy the books and records and those concepts that you are trying to teach? There must be bridges between the humanities in the life of your community and the humanities on your campus. The challenge for you is to find the links between them. Or has the thing called "school" squeezed the life from the humanities? Or has the thing called "school" squeezed the life from the people pledged to uphold them?

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

JAN 1 3 1978

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES